

any nominee, out of—listen to this one—principle, and that is because Republicans' only principle is obstruction.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he has fallen in line with the Republican leader's obstruction and followed what Donald Trump has suggested: Delay, delay, delay. He is going to great lengths to shut down voices who simply want to do their jobs. For example, at the behest of the Republican leader, he met privately with Republicans on the Judiciary Committee and twisted his colleagues' arms to sign a loyalty oath, promising to block consideration of the President's nominees. That point has already been made here and is a part of the RECORD. Next, he tried to move a committee markup behind closed doors. When Democrats objected, he canceled the meeting. He also used the Presiding Officer's chair here on the floor to shut down debate on the Supreme Court vacancy, which is really unheard of, but he did it.

Time and again, the senior Senator from Iowa has followed the orders of the Republican leader and Donald Trump and sought to silence his critics and shut the American people out of the Senate's business. Why? If the Senator's obstruction is truly supported by the Constitution and history, why wouldn't he want to have a debate in the open? Let's debate it on the Senate floor. President Obama's nominee deserves a meeting, a hearing, and a vote. The American people deserve a Senate that honors the Constitution and provides its advice and consent on Supreme Court nominees.

As Professor Carlson said, by refusing to give President Obama's nominee consideration, Senator GRASSLEY is robbing Iowans and Americans of their voice. Listening to the American people is our job, and Senate Republicans should do their job.

Mr. President, what is the Senate business today?

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Illinois.

---

#### NATIONAL SECURITY SATELLITE LAUNCHES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from Arizona took to the floor to criticize the work of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I am honored to be on that subcommittee as the vice chairman

and to work with Senator COCHRAN, the Republican from Mississippi.

The senior Senator from Arizona argued that the support for Republican Presidential candidate Donald Trump is somehow connected to the work of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I have heard some pretty outlandish claims by Mr. Trump on the campaign trail, but the fact that he would capture the hearts and minds of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee with his rhetoric is beyond me.

Senator COCHRAN has been a Member of the Senate for many years. He is respected and has worked his way up to be chairman of the full committee. I have worked with him and found him to be an excellent partner. He is bipartisan and tries to make sure that we protect our Nation's national defense. I have never found him to be in the thrall of Donald Trump, but that suggestion was made yesterday by the senior Senator from Arizona. I will leave it to the American people to judge the wisdom or absurdity of that allegation.

I would like to take a moment to correct the record on a few of the things that the senior Senator from Arizona said. The issues involved are pretty complex, but the crux of it comes down to this: The senior Senator from Arizona is proposing to waste \$1.5 billion—and perhaps as much as \$5 billion—on a controversial proposal on how the Department of Defense and intelligence agencies should launch national security satellites. In addition to costing billions of dollars—that is billions, not millions—the senior Senator from Arizona's proposal is opposed by the Secretary of Defense, Ash Carter; the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper; the Under Secretary of Defense, Frank Kendall; and the Secretary of the Air Force, Deborah James. One would think that the senior Senator from Arizona, who chairs the Defense Authorization Committee, would note that it is unified opposition from the Department of Defense to his ideas. Each of these individuals has expressed strong concern about the ideas of the senior Senator from Arizona. They have stated as clearly as they can and as often as they can that what he has in mind will harm our national security. They have even stated it in the senior Senator's committee hearings. He is either not listening, paying attention, or refusing to agree. Nevertheless, all that I did, all that the Senate has done last year with Senator COCHRAN on a bipartisan basis, was to listen to our senior national security leaders while protecting taxpayers from wasting billions of dollars.

The matter generating all of this discussion is about competition for launching defense satellites into space. Let me tell you at the outset that before I came to the subcommittee, we made a terrible decision. About 10 years ago, the two leading competitors for launching satellites into space were two private companies, Boeing Aircraft

and Lockheed. They came to the government with a suggestion, and they said: We've got a great idea. Instead of competing against one another to launch satellites—listen to this—we will merge our companies together, and we will save the government lots of money. I don't know why, but the Department of Defense and the committees on Capitol Hill bought it, and they created the United Launch Alliance, or ULA. It became a monopoly. These two merged corporations became a monopoly in launching satellites. You know what happens when you have monopoly status? The costs go up dramatically, and that is exactly what happened.

In the last 10 years, United Launch Alliance has been a reliable partner with the Department of Defense, and they have launched satellites and other things into space which have been critical for national security. But because they are a monopoly with no competition, they became very expensive.

There are new entries in the market that are promising in terms of launching satellites, and one of them is SpaceX. SpaceX has matured into a company that can play an important role in the future of satellite launches. I noted this fact, and as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I did something that is unusual by Capitol Hill standards. In January of 2014, I held a hearing. At the same table I invited the CEO of United Launch Alliance and the CEO of SpaceX to sit next to one another and testify. They answered questions about their capabilities and about the history of space launch in the future. The committee members asked them how they could save money, and each of them responded. At the end of the hearing, I suggested to each of the CEOs that they propound up to 10 questions to the other CEO that they didn't think were covered in our hearing. I tried to make this as open as possible and to invite a new competitive spirit when it came to these space launches. I think it was constructive.

It is also clear that there is another element in this issue that brought the senior Senator from Arizona to the floor. The United Launch Alliance has several engines that can take a satellite into space. The most economical one, the RD-180, is not built in America. It is built in Russia. Now, that has become a major problem. Put Vladimir Putin and his adventurism to the side here. I have even joined with the senior Senator from Arizona, condemning what Putin has done in countries such as Georgia and Ukraine and his threats to the Baltics and Poland. Put that over to the side for a moment. It is best for us to make our own engines when it comes to the launching of satellites for America's national defense and intelligence. We put millions of dollars in the appropriations bill to incentivize the building of a new engine so we can finally break away from our dependence on this Russian RD-180 engine. For 2 years we have been putting that money in the bill.

I am not opposed to competition. I favor competition. I favor an American-made engine. That is not the issue. Here is the problem: You can't just waive a wand or pass an appropriation and recreate a new rocket engine. It can take up to 5 years. What will happen in that 5-year period of time while we in America are developing at least one new American-made reliable rocket engine? We will have to be dependent either on that Russian engine in transition or run the risk that we are not going to have any engines available when we desperately need them for satellite launches. That is exactly what the Secretary of Defense has told the senior Senator from Arizona, and he just will not buy it. He has said: We have to cut the cord and walk away from the Russian engines.

Here is something he can't answer: NASA also uses engines to launch satellites and people into space. Why would we launch people into space? For the space station. How do we get those folks up to the space station and bring them home? On Russian rocket engines.

If the senior Senator from Arizona says that's it, cold turkey, no more Russian engines, what in the world is he going to do about NASA's needs for this engine in supplying the space station and making sure that the folks in orbit can safely come home? He can't answer that question because the answer truly tells him the problem he is creating here.

What we are trying to do is this: Transition to American-made engines. I am for that. Create competition for space launches in the future. I am for that. And make sure we do it in a thoughtful, sensible way and not at the expense of America's national defense, our national intelligence, or the future of our space program. We can work with the Senator from Arizona. I would like to do that, but when he comes to the floor and suggests that all of us who oppose him are somehow cronies of Vladimir Putin or marching to the orders of Donald Trump, it doesn't create a very productive environment for conversation.

Let's do the right thing. Let's work together on an appropriations authorization. Let's put the Russian engines behind us in an orderly way, let's create the American engine, and let's push for competition. That is where I got started on this, and that is where I am today.

We need to listen to the experts—the experts at the Pentagon—who have told us repeatedly that to do this cold turkey and to cut off the Russian engines is, frankly, to jeopardize our national defense, security, intelligence gathering, and even our space program. That is something I hope the senior Senator from Arizona can agree is an outcome which we should avoid.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue we are confronting in the Senate, and it is an issue folks in Pennsylvania and across the country are dealing with every day; that is, the opioid crisis. There are a lot of ways to describe this crisis. I am pleased to be able to talk about this issue with two of my colleagues who will be following me in succession after my remarks have concluded.

This Senator wants to thank, in a particular way, Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator SHAHEEN, and our leadership for bringing this issue to the forefront within our caucus and here in the Senate. I know the effort to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—known by the acronym CARA—is a bipartisan effort. I certainly appreciate that.

In the case of Senator WHITEHOUSE, he brings a deep reservoir of experience as a Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney, as well as the attorney general of Rhode Island. He brings a law enforcement set of experience as well as his caring and concern about those who have addiction issues. We appreciate his leadership. Senator BROWN has worked on this for many years in the Senate and as a Member of the House of Representatives. This is an issue that confronts all of us in our States. Our efforts have to be commensurate to match the severity of the problem.

This week the Senate missed an important opportunity to invest substantial resources in our Nation's heroin crisis. The amendment offered by Senators SHAHEEN and WHITEHOUSE would have provided \$600 million in emergency funding to aid public health professionals and law enforcement, the two main segments of our society that deal with the challenge of addiction on a daily basis. That amendment was defeated, and I think that was the wrong conclusion for the Senate and wrong for the country.

While the Senate failed to act on this amendment, there is no reason we shouldn't find other opportunities to invest in anti-heroin strategies or, expressed another way, strategies that will lessen or reduce the likelihood that more people will be addicted to some opioid which often leads to other kinds of challenges such as heroin. It too often leads not just to the darkness of addiction but literally to the darkness of death itself. We have some work to do.

We know we can pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the CARA Act, as I mentioned before. That is good, but it is not nearly enough. We

have to do more than simply pass good legislation that will authorize policies to better confront the challenge. That will not be enough. If we have in place new programs, new approaches, and new strategies, that is a measure of progress, but we can't ask medical professionals to do more to treat addiction if they don't have the resources. We cannot ask law enforcement to do more if they don't have the resources.

Heroin overdose deaths have increased 244 percent from 2007 to 2013. In roughly a 6-year timeframe, heroin overdose deaths are up 244 percent. It is hard to even comprehend that kind of increase of a death statistic—not just a number but a number that indicates the increase in the number of deaths. That alone should motivate us to do everything possible to do whatever it takes. Whatever authority, whatever policy, whatever dollars we need to invest in this, we have to do that. There are lots of other numbers, and sometimes you can get lost in reciting the numbers. I will mention a few that are relevant to Pennsylvania before I conclude.

In addition to just passing the CARA bill, we ought to focus on taking measurable steps to solve the crisis. We don't want to just address the issue, confront the challenge, we want to solve the crisis. It will not happen in 1 year, and it will not happen because of one bill or one policy, but we have to put every possible resource or tool on the table to actually solve the crisis.

There are lots of ways to illustrate the degree of the problem. I will talk about a couple of communities in Pennsylvania, just by way of example.

The Washington Post—a great newspaper here—went to Washington, PA. We have a county and city just below the city of Pittsburgh, just south of Pittsburgh, Washington County and the city of Washington. The Post went there last summer and began to interview people at the local level.

In one of the more stunning statistics they found in their reporting, in 70 minutes there were eight overdoses related to heroin—in this case not yet deaths but overdoses. A newspaper could track in 1 hour 10 minutes, eight overdoses in one community in one State. Then they tracked it over a 2-day timeframe. In 48 hours there were 25 overdoses in Washington County, PA, and 3 deaths, in a 48-hour period. I cite that not just for the compelling nature of those numbers but because of where it happened. This is not happening in communities we used to think of as having a major heroin or drug addiction problem. We tended to think of it, at least in my lifetime, as being an urban issue that big cities have this problem and less so in small towns, suburbs, and rural communities. In this case, this horror, this evil knows no geographic or class boundaries. It is happening in big cities and very small towns in Pennsylvania. It is happening in suburban communities, high- and low-income communities and